American Reference Center

PUBLIC AFFAIRS SECTION, U.S. EMBASSY, BRATISLAVA

INTERNATIONAL SECURITY / MIDDLE EAST UPDATE
September 2 - 8, 2011

---

1. Assistant Secretary Brimmer on U.S. Priorities at United Nations (09-07-2011)

Remarks by Esther Brimmer, Assistant Secretary, Bureau of International Organization Affairs
U.S. Institute of Peace, Washington, DC

Sustaining America's Global Leadership: U.S. Priorities at the United Nations

Good afternoon. Thank you, Richard, for that introduction. I want to express my appreciation to the U.S. Institute of Peace for hosting today's event. Congratulations on the opening of your new headquarters. We in the State Department are pleased to have you as our new neighbor, and I think we can agree which of our buildings is more likely to feature in an architectural magazine.

We are here today just two weeks before the opening of the 66th UN General Assembly, when the eyes of the world turn to the United Nations in New York. At this year's General Assembly, we will work with the international community on the next steps for assistance to the transition in Libya. We will address the mounting humanitarian crisis in the Horn of Africa, and peace and security in Sudan and South Sudan. We will devote high-level attention to the urgent global public health challenges posed by non-communicable diseases. And on the sidelines of the UNGA, we will co-host with Brazil the first head of state-level meeting of the Open Government Partnership, bringing countries together to strengthen governance through transparency and citizen empowerment.

But the formal agenda will take place against a backdrop of global changes, historic challenges, and new opportunities too large to fit in any meeting hall.

Looking back a year ago, none of us could have imagined the seismic political transformation taking place across North Africa and the Middle East. Though incomplete, it holds great promise for a new era in which democratic impulses and human rights are embraced, not suppressed.

Today, new centers of emerging influence are identifying the bedrock principles for their foreign policies in the 21st century. From what we have seen to date, many current and future leaders shape their outlook and approach to the world in the UN's halls and corridors, where we must highlight the expanded responsibility that comes with a greater presence on the global stage.

Here in the United States, we face our own challenges. This Administration has strengthened our national security and restored U.S. global influence by engaging multilaterally. Yet there are still some here in Washington intent on forcing a U.S. retreat from global leadership, by hindering our participation in the UN system, seemingly unaware of the profoundly altered global landscape.

It is against this backdrop that I want to discuss not only the U.S. goals for the upcoming session of the UN General Assembly, but also the Administration's approach to the UN, and the centrality of multilateral diplomacy to U.S. foreign policy in the 21st century.

In short, U.S. engagement with the UN has never been more critical or more beneficial to our nation. We cannot turn back the clock to a time when the world was simpler and less interconnected, and multilateral engagement was less essential to core U.S. interests. And we cannot dispatch U.S. diplomats to the United Nations to pursue our 21st century foreign policy objectives hobbled by a 19th century worldview, one that ignores the role multilateral bodies play in so many of our most pressing challenges.

The importance to the United States of our engagement at the UN is hardly a new phenomenon; indeed, most Democratic and Republican Administrations have understood, regardless of party, the importance and benefits to our nation of multilateral engagement.

In advance of each year's General Assembly, the State Department's International Organizations bureau – which I head – drafts a memorandum for the President, framing the strategic context and highlighting the most session's important debates. I want to share with you today a brief excerpt from a past such memo. It begins by stating that in September, "nearly every major issue of American foreign policy will be before the General Assembly of the United Nations. This would be largely true even if we did not want it that way. It is all the more true because we have deliberately decided, on some very important matters, that the United Nations must be the central forum in which to pursue our objectives."

This was written not last year or the year before; no, it dates to summer 1961, sent to President John Kennedy by my predecessor, Harlan Cleveland. And its principles are as true today as they were then, even though the world and the multilateral system have changed dramatically over the past half-century. To state them plainly: multilateral diplomacy is central to American foreign policy, and important issues will be decided at the United Nations whether or not the United States chooses to be actively engaged. But as the world has changed, our foreign policy – even how we engage multilaterally – has adapted as well.

Now more than ever, our economy and security is intertwined with that of the rest of the globe. We have seen the benefits that globalization can bring for our economy, as well as the threats and challenges that cross-border networks pose for our national security. So many of the threats we face are shared by the global community, and their solutions will require global cooperation.

Nuclear proliferation endangers the security of us all, regardless of nationality.

If not checked, the impact of climate change will further accelerate across the globe.

Attacks on freedom and universal human rights anywhere stain our collective conscience.

Terrorism and transnational crime do not respect national borders.

Pandemic disease requires no passport to move quickly from one country to another.

And we know all too well that conflict and instability, even when they fall within a single country halfway around the world, can unleash these and other dangers.

We also know that to respond to these and other threats, U.S. engagement at the United Nations works.

In Libya, the United States has worked across the UN system to marshal a robust international response to the crisis. With our allies and partners, we won tough Security Council sanctions and an International Criminal Court referral of Qadhafi's depredations. We insisted that the world would not stand by as Qadhafi's forces attacked Libyan civilians who dared express their desire for freedom. When that warning was not heeded, we went back to the Security Council and shaped a mandate to protect civilians in Libya.

Since then, an unprecedented coalition, including the United States, our NATO allies, and Arab nations, has conducted a military operation to save civilian lives. And in the course of the past few months, Libyans have stood up to Qadhafi and established a credible transition process, and are working with the international community – including the UN – to prepare for a bright, stable, and prosperous post-Qadhafi Libya.

In Afghanistan and Iraq, the UN also plays an indispensable role to contribute to political stability. UN political missions in both countries work to strengthen democracy and mediate local conflicts, allowing us to draw down our military forces on schedule.

The UN also plays a central role in global efforts to combat nuclear proliferation. Security Council sanctions on Iran have hampered that regime's efforts to develop nuclear weapons. Tough sanctions against North Korea allowed cargo vessels to be inspected and illegal arms shipments seized. The work of the International Atomic Energy Agency, too, has been invaluable in sounding the alarm on illicit nuclear activities in Iran, Syria, and elsewhere, and is a reminder of the value of investment in international institutions.

On counterterrorism, UN bodies are uniquely important. Security Council sanctions against al Qaeda have, through their universal application, isolated and frozen the assets of terrorists and their supporters. And by working through a range of other UN bodies, the United States and our partners help prevent and combat terrorism by building up national capacity, sharing best practices, and promoting aviation security.

UN peacekeepers also make an important contribution to global security and the security of the United States, one that has increased as their roles have grown more difficult and complex.

UN peace operations no longer are comprised of lightly-armed or unarmed observers, sent to monitor an agreed ceasefire line between two sovereign states. Instead, over the past decade. They have addressed some of the world's hardest and most challenging security situations – Darfur, Congo, Haiti, Cote d'Ivoire. UN peacekeeping missions protect civilians, and work to prevent and end armed conflicts. They bring stability to parts of the world that for too long, have known too little of it.

They do all this at a fraction of the cost of sending U.S. troops, and mean that we need not choose between doing it ourselves, or doing nothing. And over the years, nearly three thousand have paid the ultimate price in pursuit of a larger peace.

Today, we use our influence to ensure peacekeeping operations have the full political support of the Security Council, especially when they face challenging deployments or hostile host governments. We work to ensure that peacekeeping missions are given mandates they can achieve, and that they have the personnel and equipment needed to achieve those mandates. And we have trained more than 100,000 peacekeepers in the last six years, and supported the training by partner countries of tens of thousands more.

U.S. support for peacekeeping crosses party lines. The previous Administration oversaw the largest increase in the number of peacekeepers and missions in the history of the United Nations, with deployed peacekeepers more than doubling over an eight-year period. We continue to pay increased overall UN peacekeeping assessments compared to the year 2000, because missions created over the past decade continue their valuable work in the field. But that investment in global security reaps returns unlike almost any other tool in our diplomatic or military toolkit.

Perhaps one of the most valuable roles the UN plays is in engaging in preventive diplomacy and other efforts at staunching conflicts before they start or worsen. From the "good offices" of the Secretary-General to the dispatch of special envoys, high-level UN involvement has saved countless lives by preventing violence or halting its escalation. Though many of these "quiet diplomacy" efforts by necessity go unheralded, the human and financial cost of violent conflict make them among the smartest investments the international community can make in our shared security. As we implement the first Quadrennial Diplomacy and Development Review, which emphasized preventing and resolving armed conflict, we are looking at how the United States can further support the UN's work in these areas.

Working through the UN, we also are developing new tools and updating old ones to better address the contemporary and changed nature of armed conflict.

Special Political Missions provide UN assistance to cement peace in fragile states, without deploying military peacekeepers. Peacebuilding missions coordinate international assistance to post-conflict states, avoiding duplication and sustaining international attention to root causes of violent conflict. Peacekeeping doctrine has evolved to incorporate protection of civilians as a core function of more and more UN missions. Undergirding these efforts, the UN's Global Field Support Strategy and the New Horizon initiative are improving how UN peace operations are conducted, managed, led, and supported in the field, with logistics and support functions streamlined to reduce costs from startup through sustainment.

U.S. policy toward the UN system has evolved as well, given the myriad benefits of multilateral engagement to our national interest. I have discussed the how we work across the UN system to enhance our security, but our multilateral engagement also is an important means of advancing universal values that Americans hold dear.

Since 2009, when this Administration changed course from the previous one by running for and winning a seat on the Human Rights Council in Geneva, we have seen a dramatic improvement in that body's effectiveness. In just two years, the HRC has gone from an institution that too often was incapable of addressing real human rights crises – yet was very capable at unfairly focusing

disproportionately on Israel – to a more serious body, repeatedly responding to pressing human rights situations in real time, with concrete action and a unified voice.

In just the past year, we have engaged states on the Human Rights Council to call special sessions and launch international commissions of inquiry to investigate human rights violations in Cote d'Ivoire, Libya, and Syria, promoting international accountability and making clear that the eyes of the world are watching. The states on the Human Rights Council voted to appoint a special rapporteur on the human rights situation in Iran, and for the first time in five years, adopted a resolution on human rights in Belarus. Through the HRC, we and our partners bolstered cooperative efforts with the interim government in Tunisia and the governments in Kyrgyzstan and Guinea, to ensure attention is paid to human rights obligations during their transitions. Through a joint statement by 74 countries, we set the stage for the HRC to consider this month the alarming human rights situation in Yemen. And in June, a geographically-diverse majority of states on the Human Rights Council adopted the first resolution in the history of the United Nations on lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender rights.

How was this change possible? How did the Human Rights Council, which for its first few years was criticized as being little improvement over the Commission on Human Rights that it replaced, undergo such a radical transformation? And how did we launch this change despite rigid bloc politics in Geneva, which in many ways were worse than in the General Assembly in New York?

In a word: leadership. Not by walking away and criticizing from afar. Not by marching in and demanding that other states choose between our way or the highway. In the real world, that is not how diplomacy works. In the real world, if you want to achieve your diplomatic goals, you need to approach your international partners with a certain seriousness and commitment.

Do not underestimate the hard work needed to make that happen. I know firsthand that the transformation at the HRC has come only through an immense effort by U.S. diplomats and our partners. It has required overcoming countries that would rather the Human Rights Council not be particularly effective. We have needed to find a diplomatic way to point out where governments' words and actions in Geneva bear little resemblance to their domestic respect for human rights. More often than not, it has required utilizing bilateral diplomatic channels to pursue multilateral goals, an approach that has not traditionally been as fully employed as it ought to have been (although our regional bureaus and bilateral embassies have been strong partners).

And the change is real. Our closest allies both on and off the Human Rights Council have stated in no uncertain terms their gratitude for our engagement and for our success in steering the HRC away from its less-than-stellar history. Right now, the one thing we could do to reverse those gains would be to walk away and hand leadership back to those who would rather the Human Rights Council not be a serious human rights body.

Yet that is exactly what some are now proposing we do: pull down the flag and go home. Leave the Human Rights Council to the human rights abusers. Announce in a full voice that until HRC membership achieves perfection, the United States will treat the entire organization with contempt. And for good measure, broaden these self-inflicted injuries by withholding U.S. funding across the UN system.

This approach would restrict U.S. engagement at the UN and with the world. It is not in the U.S. interest. It would not actually achieve reform of the UN Secretariat or the Human Rights Council, or change the course of other states' actions in UN bodies. And it conflates the roles played by the United Nations itself with the actions taken by sovereign governments in the UN's chambers.

In real world diplomacy, it is pretty rare that much is achieved by standing outside the negotiating room with your arms crossed. And doing so is no way to support your closest allies when they need you most.

Now, of course the UN can be improved. For example, it is outrageous that the Human Rights Council has one agenda item focused solely on Israel, and one on all other country-specific human rights situations around the world. Item 7 should be eliminated. We have had major successes in keeping governments such as Iran and Syria off the Human Rights Council, but it is shameful when regional groups still sometimes select countries to represent their regions on the Human Rights Council that trample those very rights they should uphold and promote.

Unfortunately, Member States still sometimes take action in the UN General Assembly or elsewhere in the UN with which we vehemently disagree. We will continue to fight hard against any efforts to use UN bodies to delegitimize Israel, as well as efforts to unilaterally use the UN as the venue for addressing final status issues that must be decided in direct negotiations between the parties. When one such effort was made in February to inappropriately insert the UN into such matters, we vetoed it.

President Obama has been very clear that unilateral initiatives will not bring about a two-state solution and an enduring peace, which is what both parties and the United States seek. There is no substitute for direct negotiations between the parties. That is why the Administration continues to be focused on a negotiated outcome that will lead to the establishment of two states for two peoples, with an independent, viable Palestinian state alongside a secure state of Israel.

So while there are some legitimate criticisms of the United Nations, they frequently reflect the efforts some Member States pursue to divide and apportion blame instead of working together to solve the challenges of our time. But those missteps pale in comparison to the concrete benefits that our robust engagement at the United Nations provides the United States.

That is why we reject arguments made by some that would cede global leadership to those who would not act in our interest, or abandon the real, tangible gains that have come with enhanced U.S. multilateral engagement.

We reject also the alarmist suggestions that the UN is somehow running roughshod over U.S. interests. Aside from being factually wrong, they ignore the many ways that U.S. multilateral diplomacy advances our national security and supports the security of our allies, partners, and friends.

It misses the political reality of what actually happens across the UN system. For the most part, few substantive actions are adopted in UN bodies without U.S. support and leadership. That does not mean that achieving our goals is easy, or that we always get what we seek. There are plenty of instances where we have to press long and hard for an outcome that is not always certain. Yes, we have setbacks at the UN. Yes, there are times when we fall short, because other states' interests clash with ours and those of our partners. But by and large, through engagement across the UN, the United States is able to advance our foreign policy, and find shared solutions to global problems.

That, in part, is why we oppose the backwards calls we again are hearing to withhold U.S. dues, given the impact doing so would have on U.S. influence and leadership across the UN system. For too long, the United States played games with our UN assessments, paying them when we wanted

to and withholding them whenever we felt doing so was somehow justified. It undermined U.S. credibility, and hurt our ability to get things done at the UN.

But all this has changed. President Obama's decision to pay our UN assessments in full has given us greater influence with allies, partners, and others, and helped us achieve both our policy goals at the UN as well as much-needed management reform and budget discipline. For too long, our failure to keep current on our UN dues hamstrung our diplomats and hurt our national interest. Our adversaries used to change the subject to our arrears when we pressed them on an important policy matter. But they no longer can do so.

U.S. global leadership at the UN means we pay our fair share of the burden – not more, but also not less. But do not misunderstand me: to be sure, we are all aware that there are shortcomings in the way the UN carries out its business. As careful stewards of taxpayer dollars, this Administration is proud of the management and budget reform initiatives we have worked with the United Nations to create and implement. The United States is second to none in pursuing a more efficient, effective, and transparent UN, and our reform efforts get results.

We have recently launched the second phase of our United Nations Transparency and Accountability Initiative (UNTAI-II). This will build upon our successes of the past four years, with specific benchmarks, to monitor and evaluate progress across the entire UN system. We will work to achieve even greater reforms and improvements in the areas of oversight, accountability, ethics, financial management, and good governance. Most importantly, these efforts will help ensure that the United Nations is strong enough to bear the burdens we must place upon it in the decades to come.

So amid these calls for U.S. retrenchment, our allies and partners are wondering whether robust U.S. engagement at the UN will be sustained. They are asking themselves whether, in this era of intense global interconnectedness, the United States will abandon our unique position as a beacon of freedom and democracy, and cede our global leadership role, by restricting our engagement with the United Nations.

Let me be clear: we must not, and we will not.

As the President stated in March, "American leadership is not simply a matter of going it alone and bearing all the burden ourselves. Real leadership creates conditions and coalitions for others to step up as well, to work with allies and partners so that they bear their share of the burden and pay their share of the costs, and to see that the principles of justice and human dignity are upheld by all."

With those words, President Obama honors a long and bipartisan tradition of U.S. multilateral leadership, one that is as important today as it was in 1945.

On this, my predecessor had simple words in 1961, words that have lost none of their force in the intervening half-century. He knew then, as we know now, that U.S. engagement at the United Nations must be robust if it is to succeed. "The luxury of sitting out every second dance," he said, "is not for the leaders."

As I have highlighted today, too many U.S. interests require strong multilateral engagement across the UN system for us to simply walk away and cede U.S. leadership at the United Nations. Too many of our most pressing foreign policy challenges require shared multilateral solutions for us to undercut our global influence by withholding our UN dues.

On the eve of the 66th UN General Assembly, there remains much work to be done to help the United Nations adapt structures built in 1945 to better address the challenges of 2011 and beyond. The world has changed faster than the United Nations has. But if we are to protect our security against transnational threats, advance our values as an alternative to extremism, and promote the international stability and interaction we need in order to advance our economy, U.S. engagement in the United Nations is more essential than it has ever been.

Thank you again for this opportunity to speak at USIP.

---

2. Ambassador Rice at U.N. Briefing on Iran and Resolution 1737 (09-07-2011)

Remarks by Ambassador Susan E. Rice, U.S. Permanent Representative to the United Nations, at a Security Council Briefing on Iran and Resolution 1737, September 7, 2011

Mr. President, let me begin by thanking Ambassador Osorio for his report and briefing today. We appreciate your continued leadership as the Chair of the 1737 Committee.

The IAEA Director General's latest report – just released last week – once again highlights Iran's failure to comply with its international nuclear obligations, and its violations of several UN Security Council resolutions. Iran refuses to address outstanding issues related to its nuclear program. The Director General reports that Iran is continuing enrichment and heavy water-related activities in defiance of both this Council and the IAEA Board of Governors. Iran still refuses to respond substantively to information regarding possible military dimensions to Iran's nuclear program.

Iran's reported installation of centrifuges at Qom constitutes yet another intentional violation of UN Security Council resolutions and a clear provocation. This is unacceptable.

We condemn Iran's persistent refusal to fulfill its international nuclear obligations. Iran's actions underscore the continuing necessity of full enforcement of sanctions by the international community in order to motivate Iran to comply with those obligations and to deny Iran the ability to advance in its proscribed programs.

The United States encourages the 1737 Committee to enhance its efforts to actively implement its mandate. We are pleased that the Committee has concluded its review of the Panel of Expert's useful and informative Final Report. We are also pleased the Committee has started to act on a number of the Panel's excellent recommendations; however, much work remains to be done. We urge the Committee to take steps to complete this work and implement the Panel's recommendations as soon as possible.

I would also like to stress that my government remains seriously concerned that the Panel of Expert's Final Report has not yet been posted to the Committee's website. We strongly believe this report must be made available to all UN Member States as soon as possible as it highlights information and best practices that can help States carry out their obligations. Furthermore, failure to circulate these documents contravenes the Committee's commitment to transparency and undermines the entire purpose behind having a Panel of Experts. We urge a prompt solution to this impasse.

Since we last met, the United States, with France, Germany, and the United Kingdom, reported Iran's violation of paragraph 9 of Resolution 1929 (2010), which prohibits Iran from launches using ballistic missile technology. My government stands ready to cooperate fully with the Committee

and its Panel of Experts in their investigation of this violation. We encourage all Member States to report sanctions violations to the Committee and Panel of Experts.

Mr. President the United States remains dedicated to preventing Iran from developing a nuclear weapon. Iran's nuclear intentions are a major concern, not just for the United States, but for the region, for this Council, and for the world.

Let there be no doubt, the United States is committed to a dual-track policy of applying pressure in pursuit of a diplomatic resolution of international concerns regarding Iran's nuclear activities.

We also remain committed to working closely with our partners in the 1737 Committee, the Panel of Experts, and this Council on this important issue. Our joint efforts will demonstrate the international community's resolve to address Iran's continued disregard of its international nuclear obligations.

We have made important progress in strengthening our implementation and enforcement of UN sanctions on Iran. We must redouble our efforts to sharpen the choice for Iran's leaders to abandon their dangerous course.

Thank you, Mr. President.

---

3. Panetta Assesses National Security Threats (09-07-2011)

By Karen Parrish
American Forces Press Service

WASHINGTON, Sept. 7, 2011 – While terrorism remains a threat to national security, it is joined by cyber attacks, nuclear weapons capability and a number of rising powers among the world's nations, Defense Secretary Leon E. Panetta said in an interview broadcast last night.

"We continue to face threats from Iran and North Korea. We're living in a world where cybersecurity is now something to be concerned about," Panetta said in a televised interview with PBS' Charlie Rose.

"We also are living in a world in which there are rising powers, countries like China and Brazil and India, not to mention obviously Russia and others, that provide a challenge to us not only in trying to cooperate with them, but making sure that they don't undermine the stability of the world," he added.

Panetta said his role in meeting those threats is leading the Defense Department in effective national protection.

"It's about being in charge of the services, our men and women in uniform who have to actually go out there and do the mission," the secretary said.

In an era of persistent budget constraints, he said, defense must be more agile, both in quickly deployable forces and weapon systems and in more efficient management and procurement.

"We've got to be able to do all of this without breaking faith with those that put their lives on the line, … who are the key to whether or not our defense system works," he added.

The secretary said trust is key not only to effective defense leadership, but also to the United States' international relationships.

Panetta said his counterparts in other nations tell him the most important element in cooperating with the United States is "when we give our word, when we say we're going to do something, … they have to trust that that's going to happen. We have to be a dependable alliance partner."

The nation's troops have the same priority, he said: "When we say we're going to provide certain benefits, we'll stick to it, and that we will care for them if they're wounded, that we will be there for them because of what they're doing to try to protect this country."

Such trust is especially critical as the military's missions remain a crucial stabilizing factor in the world, he said.

While the U.S. drawdown in Iraq remains on track, the secretary said, the real question remains whether the United States will maintain a noncombat troop presence there, and if so, what kind of presence it will be. He noted that Iraqi President Nouri al-Maliki has indicated he wants Iraq to have some kind of training assistance from the United States after Dec. 31, when all U.S. troops are scheduled to be out of Iraq in accordance with a 2008 agreement between the two countries.

"And so the issue of what that will look like, how many will be there, is something that has to be negotiated with the Iraqis," Panetta said.

Meanwhile, Iran continues to try to exert a "very, very large influence" on events in Iraq, he noted.

"They clearly continue to provide weaponry to Shiia extremist groups," he said. "They clearly try to exert pressure on the government of Iraq. … And the end result is that we remain very concerned that Iran … tries to undermine the stability of Iraq and its future."

Panetta said he has spoken directly to Maliki about his concerns, and the Iraqi president shares them.

"We cannot tolerate having Iranians provide weapons to extremists to kill Americans. That is not tolerable," the secretary said. "And he agrees."

Maliki has made that case to Iran, and Iraqi forces have conducted operations against groups working to transfer weapons from Iran to Iraq, Panetta said.

"I really can't complain about the cooperation we've gotten from the Iraqis in assisting us to try to go after these groups that are attacking our forces," the secretary added.

In Afghanistan, International Security Assistance Force Commander Marine Corps Gen. John R. Allen and U.S. Ambassador Ryan C. Crocker make a good team, the secretary said, working effectively with Afghan President Hamid Karzai and the Afghans in trying to make sure the best policies are in place.

ISAF operations in Afghanistan have seriously weakened the Taliban, Panetta added.

"We expected a greater offensive this year than took place," he said. "And I think in large measure the reason it didn't take place is … we have reduced the influence of the Taliban, and as a result have given Afghanistan back to the Afghans."

Afghan security forces are "doing the job," he said.

"They're going out with our troops. They're putting themselves on the line. They're in battle, and they're doing a good job," Panetta said. "So I'm feeling much better about the situation in terms of … being able to turn more of this over to them."

The larger question mark for Afghanistan's future, the secretary said, is the Afghans' ability to govern in a manner that provides for future stability.

Security transition thus far has been successful, he said, and by 2014, the Afghan people should be "well on the path" to securing and governing their nation for the future.

Successful reconciliation between Afghan leaders and former Taliban members requires insurgents to meet the conditions that the United States and Afghanistan set down, he said.

"They've got to … give up their arms, to become a part of their government, and to renounce al-Qaida," he noted. "I think they have to be part of the political process that ultimately comes together in Afghanistan if it's going to be successful."

Both the United States and Pakistan also should be part of that process, Panetta said. Pakistan is critical to regional stability, he noted, because it is a nuclear power, its forces are working to combat terrorism, and the nation has a role to play in establishing stability in the region.

The secretary said he has "made very clear" to both Gen. Ahmad Shuja Pasha, director general of Pakistan's Inter-Services Intelligence agency, and Gen. Ashfaq Parvez Kayani, Pakistan's army chief of staff, that terrorism is a threat to both their country and to the United States.

"If you're against terrorism, you have to be against all forms of terrorism," Panetta said. "You can't just pick and choose among them."

During those talks, the secretary said, he made the point to both Pakistani leaders that al-Qaida has a large presence in their country's federally administered tribal areas, and the group continues to plan attacks on the United States from there.

"I made very clear to the Pakistanis that we will defend ourselves," he said. "We will go after al-Qaida in the tribal area so that they never have the opportunity to attack this country again."

The Pakistanis have worked with the United States to kill or capture terrorists, he said.

"While we have controversies and we have differences in a number of areas," he said, "we've got to do everything possible to work with them."

Intelligence-gathering efforts following the successful raid on Osama bin Laden's compound in the Pakistani city of Abottabad provided encouraging evidence of al-Qaida's decline, the secretary said.

"They were hurting in terms of their financing," he said. "We actually knew … even before the raid that they were having a much harder time developing the financial support that they had had in the past."

Attacks on al-Qaida's leaders have led to the organization's financial struggles, Panetta said.

"When you have people on the run, it makes it very tough to raise money and stay on the run at the same time," he explained.

The United States and its allies conduct sophisticated and targeted operations, he said.

"These are probably the most precise weapons in the history of warfare," the secretary told Rose, "and they are used very effectively to go after a very precise target."

Panetta stressed that in addition to military approaches, true national security requires diplomatic approaches to challenges.

"If you're talking about national security in this country, it isn't something that is just a tank and a gun and an airplane. It's got to be diplomacy as well," he said. "And it's that combination of military strength and diplomatic strength that gives us the ability to try to provide direction to the world and try to assist it so that it heads in the right way."

Biography: Leon E. Panetta
Related Article: Panetta: Al-Qaida Weakened, But Still Poses Threat

---

4. Strengthening International Missile Defense Cooperation (09-05-2011)

Keynote Speech at the 2011 Multinational BMD Conference, Copenhagen, Denmark
By Frank A. Rose, Deputy Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Arms Control, Verification and Compliance

Thank you so much for inviting me to speak today. I am very pleased to have the opportunity to once again give remarks at this distinguished gathering of ballistic missile defense (BMD) industry experts as well as senior U.S. and foreign officials.

It's wonderful to be back in Copenhagen. President Obama said earlier this year that despite being a relatively small country Denmark is a country that punches above its weight. This is certainly true in regard to Denmark's support for missile defense. One of the United States' key early cooperative efforts with allies on missile defense was with Denmark and the Home Rule Government of Greenland in upgrading the Thule early warning radar for BMD purposes. We're grateful to our Ally, Denmark, for its early cooperation.

Expanding international efforts and cooperation on BMD with our allies and partners is a key objective of the Obama Administration's BMD policy. We've been working closely with our allies and partners in Europe, East Asia, and the Middle East to strengthen cooperation in regional approaches tailored to the specific threats faced in each region.

The threat from short-, medium-, and intermediate-range ballistic missiles to our deployed forces, allies, and partners is growing, and this threat is likely to increase in both volume and complexity in the coming years. Many states are increasing their inventories, and making their ballistic missiles

more accurate, reliable, mobile, and survivable. Trends in ballistic missiles show increased ranges, more advanced propellant systems, better protection from pre-launch attack, and the ability to counter BMD systems.

Iran, for example, is fielding increased numbers of mobile regional ballistic missiles and claims to have incorporated anti-missile defense tactics and capabilities into its ballistic missile forces. During its war games earlier this year, Iran unveiled missile silo facilities and claimed to have demonstrated a capability to strike targets inside Israel and southeastern Europe with successfully tested solid-propellant, 2,000 kilometer medium-range ballistic missiles. Iran is likely working to improve the accuracy of its short- and medium-range ballistic missiles.

In North Korea, the regime continues to display provocative behavior including ballistic missile development efforts, which jeopardize peace and stability in the region. North Korea has conducted numerous ballistic missile tests, including the failed effort to launch the long-range Taepo Dong-2 missile in April 2009.

Countries such as Iran and North Korea continue to pursue ballistic missiles with extended ranges, in addition to their short-, medium-, and intermediate-range missiles that already threaten U.S. our deployed forces, allies and partners. Iran and North Korea continue to pursue indigenous space launch vehicle programs, which could aid their development of longer-range ballistic missile systems. On June 15, Iran used its Safir space launch vehicle to lift the 34-pound Rasad-1 satellite into orbit. Iran has also shown the intent to develop even more powerful rockets and in 2010 unveiled plans for a four-engine, liquid-propellant Simorgh rocket able to carry a 220-pound satellite into orbit.

Recognizing the seriousness of the ballistic missile threat, the United States seeks to create an environment, based on strong cooperation with allies and partners, which will eliminate an adversary's confidence in the effectiveness of missile attacks and thereby devalue the development, acquisition, deployment, and use of ballistic missiles by proliferators. To that end, President Obama has made international cooperation on missile defense a key Administration priority and is pursuing specific regional approaches in Europe, East Asia, and the Middle East.

In sync with our BMD cooperation goals, we're also working hard to prevent missile proliferation. The U.S. actively participates in the Missile Technology Control Regime (MTCR), which serves as the global standard for controlling the transfer of equipment, software, and technology that could make a contribution to the development of WMD-capable missile and unmanned aerial vehicle delivery systems. We support the Hague Code of Conduct Against Ballistic Missile Proliferation (HCOC), and are working through the Proliferation Security Initiative (PSI) to help partners improve their ability to stop shipments of proliferation concern. These are just some of our ongoing efforts to tackle the missile threat and prevent missile proliferation. While much of this work is performed quietly, the impact of all of these efforts is of crucial importance to international peace and security.

Europe

Let me now discuss our efforts here in Europe, which has received a great deal of attention. In order to augment the defense of the United States and provide more comprehensive and more rapid BMD protection to our European Allies, in 2009 the President outlined a four-phase implementation plan for European defense. Through the European Phased Adaptive Approach (EPAA), the United States will deploy increasingly capable BMD assets to defend Europe against a ballistic missile threat that is increasing both quantitatively and qualitatively.

The EPAA is being implemented within the NATO context. At the 2010 Lisbon Summit, NATO approved a new Strategic Concept and decided to develop the capability to defend NATO European populations, territory and forces against the growing threat from ballistic missile proliferation. At the Summit, NATO Heads of State and Government also decided to expand the scope of the NATO Active Layered Theatre Ballistic Missile Defense (ALTBMD) program to serve as the command, control, and communications network to support this new capability. These decisions have created a framework for Allies to contribute and optimize BMD assets for their collective defense. The Allies welcomed the EPAA as a U.S. national contribution to the new NATO territorial BMD capability, in support of our commitment to the collective defense of the Alliance under Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty.

To implement the new NATO capability, NATO continues to make progress in developing the command and control procedures for NATO BMD, and when ready, the United States will be able to formally contribute the EPAA assets to the NATO BMD capability. Our European Allies also have systems that they could contribute as well. Some of our Allies, for example, have Aegis ships with advanced sensor capabilities that could provide valuable contributions even without SM-3 interceptors. Our Allies also possess land- and sea-based sensors that could be linked into the system, as well as lower tier systems, such as PATRIOT, that can be integrated and used to provide point defense.

As President Obama has stated, the United States is committed to deploying all four phases of the EPAA. We have already made tremendous progress in implementing this new approach.

EPAA Phase 1 gained its first operational element in March with the deployment of an Aegis BMD-capable multi-role ship, the USS Monterey, to the Mediterranean. The deployment of an AN/TPY-2 radar in the 2011 timeframe in Turkey will also be part of EPAA Phase 1.

For Phase 2 of the EPAA, we concluded negotiations with Romania on May 4, 2011 to host a U.S. land-based SM-3 BMD interceptor site, designed to provide protection against medium-range ballistic missiles. The day before, on May 3, the United States and Romania announced the joint selection of the Deveselu Air Base near Caracal, Romania. We expect to sign the basing agreement in the near future. The land-based SM-3 system to be deployed to Romania is anticipated to become operational in the 2015 timeframe.

In July 2010, we reached final agreement with Poland to place a similar U.S. BMD interceptor site there in the 2018 timeframe. We are currently in the final stages of bringing this agreement into force.

Finally, with respect to Phase 4, the Department of Defense has begun concept development of a more advanced interceptor for deployment in the 2020 timeframe.

An update on European missile defense should also include a mention our efforts to develop cooperation with Russia. Missile defense cooperation with Russia is a Presidential priority, as it has been for several previous U.S. Administrations. When President Obama announced his new vision for missile defense in Europe in September 2009, he stated that "we welcome Russia's cooperation to bring its missile defense capabilities into a broader defense of our common strategic interests." We believe that missile defense cooperation with Russia will not only strengthen our bilateral and NATO-Russia relationships, but could enhance NATO's missile defense system. Successful missile defense cooperation would provide concrete benefits to Russia, our NATO Allies, and the United States – and will strengthen, not weaken – strategic stability over the long term.

Right now we have the opportunity to advance regional and trans-regional security through concrete missile defense cooperation with Russia, both bilaterally and within the NATO-Russia Council (the N-R-C). A Joint Review of 21st Century Common Security Challenges was completed last year in the NATO-Russia Council. NATO and Russia are now working to resume theater missile defense exercises and conduct a comprehensive Joint Analysis of the future framework for missile defense cooperation. We also are looking to renew our NRC and bilateral theater missile defense cooperation with Russia and have recently finished a bilateral Joint Threat Assessment of ballistic missile threats. We are also seeking to complete work with Russia on a Defense Technology Cooperation Agreement that would provide a framework for a host of defense-related research and development activities, including missile defense.

Political misunderstandings about the capabilities of the proposed NATO system—specifically that the system would target Russian ICBMs, thereby undermining Russia's strategic deterrent—are unfounded. We hope to build a durable framework for missile defense cooperation with Russia, and we have worked at the highest levels of the United States Government to be transparent about our missile defense plans and capabilities and to explain that our planned missile defense programs do not threaten Russia or its security. We will continue these efforts to explain that our missile defenses are being deployed against regional threats from the Middle East, and are neither designed, nor do they have the capability, to threaten the large numbers and sophisticated capability of Russia's strategic forces.

We have also been clear that the United States cannot accept limitations or restrictions on the development or deployment of U.S. missile defenses. The United States views missile defense cooperation as an opportunity for true partnership which would enhance both Russian and NATO capabilities to defend against ballistic missile attacks and would send a powerful signal to regional actors such as Iran, that Russia and the U.S. are working together to counter the threat posed by the proliferation of ballistic missiles. Let me be clear, the United States BMD capability is critical to our national security policy and countering a growing threat to our deployed forces, allies, and partners; and therefore, no nation or group of nations will have veto power over U.S. missile defense efforts. And while we seek to develop ways to cooperate with Russia on BMD, it is important to remember that under the terms of Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty, NATO alone will bear responsibility for defending the Alliance from the ballistic missile threat.

We believe that through cooperation, Russia will gain the reassurance it is seeking, without limitations that the United States – and NATO – cannot accept. Missile defense cooperation is in the common interests of the United States, NATO, and Russia, and such cooperation will enhance the security of not only those participating, but the overall international community as well.

East Asia

While the progress made on the EPAA has undoubtedly gotten the majority of attention over the past two years, it is just one part of U.S. missile defense efforts globally. In East Asia, the United States is committed to working with our allies and partners to strengthen stability and security in the region. In order to implement our efforts in this region, the phased adaptive approach will build on the existing bilateral BMD cooperation with our allies and partners.

Japan is one of our closest allies in the region, as well as a leader in missile defense and one of the United States' closest BMD partners. The United States and Japan have made significant strides in interoperability. The United States and Japan regularly train together, and our forces have successfully executed cooperative BMD operations. Japan has acquired a layered integrated BMD

system that includes Aegis BMD ships with Standard Missile 3 interceptors, Patriot Advanced Capability 3 (PAC-3) fire units, early warning radars, and a command and control system. We also worked cooperatively to deploy a forward-based X-band radar in Japan. At the June meeting of the Security Consultative Committee ministerial, the Ministers welcomed the progress both countries have made in cooperation on ballistic missile defense, calling particular attention to the joint SM-3 program.

One of our most significant cooperative efforts is the co-development of a next-generation SM-3 interceptor, called the Block IIA. This co-development program represents not only an area of significant technical cooperation but also the basis for enhanced operational cooperation to strengthen regional security. We also have jointly agreed to study future issues in preparation for transition to the production and deployment phase, as well as the potential for transfers to select third parties.

The Republic of Korea (ROK) is also a key U.S. ally and, recognizing the North Korean missile threat, the United States stands ready to work with the ROK to strengthen its BMD capabilities. The ROK has acquired Aegis ships and PATRIOT batteries and has indicated interest in acquiring a missile defense capability that includes land- and sea-based systems, early warning radars, and a command and control system. We are working together to define possible future ROK BMD requirements. The United States looks forward to taking further steps to build upon this ongoing missile defense cooperation.

Australia was one of the first U.S. partners on BMD when it signed a BMD Framework MOU with the U.S. in July 2004. Australia has been a strong supporter of the Nimble Titan series of multilateral missile defense wargames and bilateral technology cooperation with the United States. We continue to consult with Australia bilaterally regarding missile defense cooperation. Similar to some of our Allies in Europe, Australia has a class of combatants – the Air Warfare Destroyer – that uses the Aegis Combat System that could be upgraded in the future to provide a missile defense capability.

Engaging China in discussions of U.S. missile defense policy and plans is also an important part of our international efforts. China, like Russia, has expressed some concern with U.S. ballistic missile defenses. We continue to be transparent in our intentions and capabilities to foster greater understanding, and have clearly stated that our missile defenses are not designed to threaten Chinese strategic forces. We are committed to continuing to be transparent with China, while seeking further dialogue on a wide-range of strategic issues, including missile defense. It is important, however, that China understand that the United States will work to ensure regional stability. We are committed to a positive, cooperative relationship with China, while defending against regional ballistic missile threats regardless of their origins.

The Middle East

In the Middle East, the United States has had a continuous missile defense presence and seeks to strengthen cooperation with its partners in the Gulf Cooperation Council. A number of states in the region already deploy PATRIOT batteries and are exploring purchases of some missile defense capabilities under the auspices of the foreign military sales (FMS) program. We will work with the countries in this region to develop a Phased Adaptive Approach that integrates these capabilities into an effective system.

Due to the serious nature of the region's missile threat, the United States and Israel coordinate extensively on missile defense issues. We have a long history of cooperation on plans, operations

and specific missile defense programs. In addition to our regular consultations, the United States and Israel have conducted Juniper Cobra, a joint biennial exercise aimed at integrating interceptors, radars and other systems, since 2001. In 2008, our countries worked together to deploy a powerful AN/TPY-2 X-band radar to Israel to enhance Israel's missile detection capabilities.

Our cooperative efforts on research and development have paid off on successful missile defense systems such as the jointly developed Arrow Weapon System. Earlier this year, Israel and the United States successfully detected, tracked, and intercepted a ballistic target missile using the Arrow Weapon System, which has the capability to defend Israel against short- and medium-range ballistic missiles. While we currently co-manufacture the Arrow-2, work is being done to design a more capable Arrow-3, which will be capable of intercepting longer-range ballistic missiles further from Israel. The United States and Israel are also co-developing the "David's Sling" Weapon System, which is designed to defend against short-range rocket and missile threats. The United States has also supported Israel's Iron Dome interceptor system, which has shown its effectiveness since its deployment near Gaza in April of this year.

Conclusion

The increasing threat associated with the proliferation of ballistic missiles reinforces the importance of the collaborative missile defense efforts I just outlined. However, beyond bilateral cooperation, we need to develop regional missile defense architectures that will enable us to leverage our bilateral cooperation so that nations share ballistic missile defense information and capabilities on a multilateral basis. As Under Secretary Tauscher said in March, "there still is much more work to be done to implement new regional approaches outside of Europe." While we think about what a phased adaptive approach would look like in Asia and the Middle East, we recognize that each region has unique factors that will likely shape our approach in ways that are different from our approach in Europe. Each region has unique threats, capabilities, history, and geography. Our allies and partners in the Middle East and Asia have their own missile defense assets and each brings different advantages to the missile defense table. We need to figure out how we can leverage those advantages to provide the best protection for the United States, our deployed forces, and our allies and partners.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to your questions.

---

5. World Community Welcomes Libya's Transitional Council (09-02-2011)

Washington — Leaders of nations and international organizations are welcoming Libya back into the community of nations, while recognizing that Libyan civilians need continued NATO protections until the threat of violence has passed.

"Nearly 70 countries so far have recognized the TNC [Transitional National Council], including 18 African nations, the Arab League and now Russia," said U.S. Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton at a Paris briefing September 1. "It is time for others to follow suit," she said after a multilateral meeting where leaders sketched the outline of a new Libya, won through a citizen uprising that began six months ago.

Mustafa Abdul Jalil, chairman of the TNC, attended the Paris meeting, organized after the rebels gained control of the capital, Tripoli, about a week ago. Jalil said in Paris that the world had placed a bet on the success of the insurgents. "The Libyans showed their courage and made their dream real," he said.

International leaders acknowledged that the TNC will need help to set the nation aright after 40 years in the grip of President Muammar Qadhafi, and giving the rebel leadership access to national assets is a key step.

"The United States and our partners have worked through the United Nations to unfreeze billions of dollars in order for Libya to get access to their state assets to meet critical needs," said Clinton. She said a release of Libyan funds was in motion, with the expectation that $1.5 billion might be disbursed within days.

French President Nicolas Sarkozy, who hosted the meeting with British Prime Minister David Cameron, also expressed willingness to recognize the TNC as the legitimate claimant to those funds. "We are committed to returning to the Libyans the monies of yesterday for the building of tomorrow," Sarkozy said.

Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon represented the United Nations in Paris and called on the Security Council to make a decision on deployment of a civilian mission to assist in stabilizing the country and building civic institutions.

In return for international support, Jalil said, the fledgling leadership of Libya must "have security in Libya, tolerance and forgiveness must be promoted, the state of law must be respected."

Clinton commended the TNC for its repeated pledges to pursue those values in governance. "The international community will be watching and supporting Libya's leaders as they keep their commitments to conduct an inclusive transition, act under the rule of law, and protect vulnerable populations," Clinton said. "And that should include enshrining the rights of women as well as men in their new constitution."

The TNC leaders requested the expertise of other governments in a wide range of activities, Clinton said, such as establishing an accountable and transparent financial system and an impartial and independent police force. She said the TNC will also seek assistance from the international community in resolving social needs such as housing for citizens who fled the violence and return to wrecked homes.

Clinton said the Paris meeting "validated the confidence that all the other nations around the table had placed in the TNC." At the same time, she said, "they still have a huge hill to climb here."

With the sanction of a U.N. Security Council resolution authorizing a no-fly zone over Libya, the U.S., European and Arab partners began operations in March to prevent a humanitarian catastrophe in Libya and address the threat posed to international peace and security as Qadhafi violently cracked down on protesters and civilians fled the country.

`